서울경제 가짜뉴스 팩트체크 관련

1. 서울경제 4/29 일 보도

□ 제목: “재생에너지에 과도한 보조금 ‘비효율’ … 원전 완전배제 말아야”

□ 지면: 4/29(월) A05 면 종합

□ 인터넷판: 2019-04-28 17:27:24

https://www.sedaily.com/NewsView/1VI1J8SOUX)

□ [에너지믹스, 해외서 배운다] 기획의 첫 번째 기사

□ 부제: <1>에너지전환 공짜는 없다…獨 에너지 전문가에게 듣다

2. 김성환 의원실에서 3 명의 전문가에게 팩트체크 확인 이메일 발송

Dear Dr. Schmidt, Dr. Fischedick, and Dr. Pittel

Warm greetings from Jaehyun Jang, South Korea

I am a Policy Aide to a Congressman, Sunghwan KIM, a member of the Trade, Industry and Energy, SMEs and Startups Committee at the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea.

I would like to ask a number of questions regarding your interview article by Seoul Economic Daily (SEDAILY) about the Korean energy transition policy. The article was published in the internet page of the SEDAILY on Apr 28th and on the paper of today(Apr 29th).

Link to the internet article: https://www.sedaily.com/NewsView/1VI1J8SOUX

Frankly speaking, in my opinion, the energy transition policy of the current South Korean government has been excessively criticized by the opposition parties, the conservative and economic media, the nuclear industry and etc. It's because they either lose their interest due to the energy transition policy or they see it's politically beneficial to undermine the policy.

Even though I do strongly respect everybody has a different opinion and everybody has a right to express their opinion freely, due to the sheer amount of fake news or distorted news I have witnessed so far regarding the governmental transition policy, it would be very much appreciated if you could kindly check whether the SEDAILY correctly quoted and referred your opinion in the published article.

The title of the article in Korean could be translated as "[Energymix, Learning from Overseas] "Excessive Subsidy on Renewables is Inefficient"..."(Korean) should not exclude nuclear opinion"

Let me provide translation of the parts where SEDAILY quoted and referred your opinion. Highlighted in blue are direct translation of the parts and the ones in brackets are my explanation

for your easier understanding.

#1. They (you three) largely give three pieces of advice.
"The Korean energy policy costs a lot, so the government in advance should persuade people that people will take increasing burden",
"Do not decide everything now, but continue discussing in the long term", and
"Germany is not an answer. South Korea should find its own answer".

#2. First of all, they (you three) are largely negative on German Energiewende of nuclear phase out, coal phase out and 100% renewables when they are asked to evaluate it. The President Schmidt says "Getting out of nuclear and fossil fuel economy is a very ambitious thing. However, the renewable policy with the enormous subsidy gives considerable burden to German people and Germany is not going to meet its 2020 GHGs reduction target because the energy pricing policy is not based on GHGs emission." Directer Pittel says, "The subsidy on RE is 2.5 billion Euro per year and it is very inefficient".

#3. They (you three) all agree that if South Korea pursues an energy transition policy, people will take increasing cost. It means it is disingenuous that Korean government explains 'there will be no burden on increasing electricity tariff due to energy transition policy'.

(For your information, the Korean government never said that there will be no increase of electricity tariff. In fact, it clearly announced that there will be 10.9% increase by 2030 due to the energy transition policy. The problem of the part 3 above is that it doesn't use double quotation marks but single quotation marks but it seems that you three said that the South Korean government is disingenuous. Have you said that?)

#4. The Director Pittel says "The current Korean energy policy is a solution which costs a lot", "If the Korean government decides the electricity tariff, it can not to increase the tariff, but the cost will increase anyway and somebody needs to pay for it", "In Germany, the electricty tariff is decided by market and the government can't intervene. Therefore, once renewables is expanded, the electricity tariff got skyrocketed".

My question to all Dr. Pittel is that in the interview whether you said an energy transition costs a lot or the Korean energy transition costs a lot. If the former, then I do agree that it is universally true but we need to also consider how much benefits an energy transition could bring as well as how much externalities could be reduced compared to fossil fuel and nuclear centered system. However, the SEDAILY clearly quotes that "The current Korean energy policy" as if it implies that the South Korean energy policy is a more costly than other energy transition policies in other countries. Please kindly check what was your intention for the quote.

#5. It is critical to have a democratic process when a government promotes an energy transition policy. The Vice-President Fischedick says, "it is true that it (energy transition) costs more" and "In order to succeed in energy transition, (the government) should open good and bad things about various energy sources to people and stakeholders through a multi-dimensional evaluation". The President Schmidt also says, "A dictatorial government could solve a problem easily, but people will not join it(energy transition.", "Do not try to solve everything now but to continue conversation in the long term in order to find a compromising point".

My question to Dr. Fischedick is that whether you have used the term 'a dictatorial government' or not in the quote above. It's because those who don't support the Korean energy transition or those who lose their interest due to the energy transition try to frame the government policy as a "dictatorial policy". Of course, I agree with the sentence and also some argue that the current South Korean governmental energy policy has not listened enough of people and stakeholders, but I just would like to check whether you actually said the term.

#6. The Director Pittel gave a piece of advice that South Korea should not totally exclude nuclear and coal generation. He says, "In order to pursue an energy transition in long-term, running nuclear and coal and gradually replacing with renewables is better". "Through this (keeping nuclear and coal) you can decrease air pollution and meet your GHGs emission reduction target and you can get more public support on the increasing cost for energy transition".

Regarinig #6, my question to Dr. Pittel is, firstly, I would like to know whether you said that "South Korea should not totally exclude nuclear and coal" or not. Secondly, if yes, I wonder whether you have been informed that the current governmental nuclear phase out policy will increase (due to the ones under construction) the nuclear capacity up to 2027. There are 24 reactors in operation now and 5 are under construction. The governmental nuclear phase out policy basically pursues no more new build, and no lifetime extension. It means the total nuclear capacity in 2038 (20 years later) will be still 16.4GW compared to 22.5GW in 2017. Furthermore, the complete nuclear phase out year will be 2084 which is 62 years later than the German target of 2022. Also, we have 61 coal fired power plants and 7 are under construction. The coal will not lose its status as one of the major sources for electricity by 2040s and 2050s and it won't be phase out before 2060. Therefore, in my opinion, the current South Korean governmental policy is actually not different from what you said (if you said so) "running nuclear and coal and gradually replacing with renewables is better". Or I would say it is too slow and not ambitious. Do you really think, still the South Korean government needs to consider more nuclear and coal in the current road map?

In overall, what you three have advised in the article are actually quite common sense. No free lunch. Governments listen to people. Gradual transition is better than radical. Let market works. LNG is not the best option but could be a short-term second worst solution. Every country has different natural environment, political context, and economics so it should find its own way. However, I assume, the SEDAILY either directly distorted or maliciously distorted it. If not, kindly let me know please.

You all might be bit of surprising to receive this email to me. However, as a person majored renewable energy policy in Europe (Sweden, UK, Hungary and Greece), has worked for about 7 years to promote energy transition and work as an adviser to a Congressman, I have witnessed literally tens of thousands malicious fake and distorted news since the energy transition policy was announced in June 2017, I have become a bit more careful to what to believe in the news.

Thank you very much for your time and kind reply in advance.

If you have any questions or need any facts and data regarding the South Korean energy system, I would be very happy to provide and help.

Looking forward to hearing from you,

Sincerely yous,

Jaehyun Jang

3. 만프레드 피셰디크의 1차 답변

Dear Jaehyun Jang,

Thank you very much for the kind information and the request for clarification. Due to my tight schedule I can only give a short feedback, sorry for that, but a direct replay seems to be very important from my point of view.

Actually I'm a little bit surprised to hear that the interview provides the basis for a negative interpretation of an ambitious energy transition pathway. That's absolutely not my intention and I can not remember that I transported such kind of „tone“ in the interview. In contrary I made very clear that there is no alternative to change the existing energy system and to step into a more sustainable and resilient energy future in Germany and (!) South Korea. I know that may colleagues Mr. Schmidt and Ms. Pittel are much more highlighting the costs associated with the

German „Energiewende“ and are in general are critical with regard to the German Energiewende, but do not (as I do) stress the co-benefits (socio-economic benefits and others) and do not (as I do) stress that a Business as Usual development at the end comes up with even higher costs as you have to react faster in future decades when potential damages of the current pathway become more visible. There is another point that I would like to mention (and did in the interview), that is the fact that the costs associated with the Renewable Energy Law in Germany (without any doubt German electricity consumers have to pay a significant amount of money to support market penetration for renewable energy based electricity generation) have the basis in the years 2010 up to 2015 when market dynamic and penetration rate was high and specific costs of renewables (particularly photovoltaic systems) were very high as well. The current situation is totally different as PV module prices decreased dramatically over the past years and enable now a comparable cheap market penetration of renewables. Coming back to South Korea that means that the situation now is quite different and gives the country a chance to go along an energy transition pathways without the high costs that accompanied the German Energiewende at the beginning of the decade.

The summary you gave at the end of your email

"In overall, what you three have advised in the article are actually quite common sense. No free lunch. Governments listen to people. Gradual transition is better than radical. Let market works. LNG is not the best option but could be a short-term second worst solution. Every country has different natural environment, political context, and economics so it should find its own way.“

is more or less in line with my interpretation. There is considering the different conditions and path dependencies of each country no chance to make a 1:1 copy of an successful energy system transition from an other country, however there is a chance to learn from each other and to avoid failures others made in the past. And yes, I made very clear that shaping a successful energy system transition pathways needs an open and transparent debate involving the people, inviting them the be part of the change process and tell them the truth, that no form of energy provision comes along with no (!) impacts. So, it is role of the political and public debate to decide about the appropriate way. From my point of view there are a lot of convincing arguments that the combination of further (fast) market penetration of renewable energies and at the same time improving the energy efficiency (at the supply and demand side) should be the basis.

And no, I never used the phrase 'a dictatorial government‘ in a way that could be misinterpreted, I - as mentioned above - highlighted the meaning of an open and transparent public discourse as the right and necessary format for a successful energy system transition pathways. Otherwise you will never get the necessary public acceptance and active support for such an ambitious endeavor.

I very much hope that South Korea is eager and brave enough to start an ambitious energy system transition pathway as this would not only be positive for the country itself, but would (with South Korea as one of the „technology rich countries“) also provide an every important signal and triggering moment for the global energy system transition dynamic.

Hope the brief feedback helps! Thank you very much again for the information.

Kind regards,
Manfred

Prof. Dr. Manfred Fischedick

Vice President and
Director Future Energy and Mobility Structures

Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment, Energy

Professor at Schumpeter School of Business and Economics (University of Wuppertal)

contact address:
Wuppertal Institute
Döppersberg 19
42103 Wuppertal
Germany

0049-202-2492-121
0049-202-2492-221 (secretary)
0049-202-2492-108 (FAX)

manfred.fischedick@wupperinst.org

Assistent to the Vice President:
Tatjana Kausemann M.Sc.
0049-202-2492-221
Tatjana.Kausemann@wupperinst.org

4. 김성환 의원실의 2차 이메일

Dear. Dr. Fischedick,

Thank you so much for your kind reply. As I expected, the SEDAILY has not properly delivered your message. Even considering the fact that media has discretion of what to report and what to emphasize, this case went over an appropriate line.

Do you mind if I share your reply with other two experts or is there a specific reason that you didn't copy your reply to others?

I would like to contact a more independent media here to correctly deliver your message. If you have any concern for that, please kindly let me know.

Also, if you have any additional comments, you are more than welcome to provide.

Again, thank you so much.

Best regards,

Jaehyun Jang

5. 김성환 의원실의 2차 이메일

Dear Jaehyun Jang,

Thank you very much for your swift reply and please go ahead with sharing the feedback to others that might be interested.

This morning also Prof. YUN, Sun-Jin contacted me and I gave here the same feedback.

So, hopefully there will be a way to get the right messages across.